AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Attached herewith is one (1) new drawing sheet to be added in reply to the Office Action dated October 30, 2008. The new drawing is not believed to add new matter to the original disclosure. More specifically, the changes are as follows:

Fig. 8 has been added to show a block diagram showing elements of a downloader according to the present invention.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 30, 2008. Claims 13-15, 17-19, and 21-23 are presented for examination, of which Claims 13, 17 and 21 are in independent form. Claims 12, 16 and 20 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 13, 17 and 21 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested. The canceled claims will not be further addressed herein.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) on the ground that they fail to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, the Office Action states that the obtaining unit, designation unit, selection unit, conversion unit, determination unit and download unit must be shown in the drawings. Applicant has carefully reviewed the drawings and added Figure 8, which is a block diagram showing elements of a downloader, including the obtaining unit, designation unit, conversion unit, determination unit and download unit. The elements shown in Figure 8 correspond to features of Claim 13 and the steps depicted in Figure 2 (and described in the corresponding portion of the specification). Accordingly, it is believed that no new matter has been added. The selection window recited in the claims is shown in Figure 5. It is believed that the objection to the drawings has been obviated and its, withdrawal is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Claims 12-14, 16-18 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.5,361,332 (Yoshida et al.).

Claims 15, 19 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,699,524 (Ooishi et al).

As shown above, Applicant has amended independent Claims 13, 17 and 21 in terms that more clearly define what he regards as his invention. Applicant submits that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 13 is directed to a font downloading apparatus, including: (1) a first obtainment unit, configured to obtain first code systems utilizable by a printer to which a font is to be downloaded; (2) a designation unit, configured to designate a font; (3) a second obtainment unit, configured to obtain a second code system of a font designated by the designation unit; (4) a determination unit, configured to determine whether or not the second code system is included in the first code systems; (5) a display unit configured to display a selection window accepting a user selection of a code system from among the first code systems obtained by the first obtainment unit when the determination unit determines that the second code system is not included in the first code systems; (6) a first conversion unit, configured to convert a data format of the font into a data format utilizable by the printer when the determination unit determines that the second code system is included in the first code systems; (7) a second conversion unit, configured to convert a code system of the font designated by the designation unit in conformity with the code system selected in the selection window, and then convert a data format of the font into a data format utilizable by the printer; and (8) a download unit, configured to download to the printer the font of which the code system is converted by the first conversion unit or the font of which the code system and the data format are converted by the second conversion unit.

Among other notable features of Claim 13 are (1) a display unit configured to display a selection window accepting a user selection of a code system from among the first code

10

systems obtained by the first obtainment unit when the determination unit determines that the second code system is not included in the first code systems and (2) a second conversion unit, configured to convert a code system of the font designated by the designation unit in conformity with the code system selected in the selection window, and then convert a data format of the font into a data format utilizable by the printer.

Yoshida relates to an information outputting method for an information processing device including loading font information from another information processing device when the subject information processing device does not have the font information, and transmitting information in accordance with the loaded font information. Yoshida discusses discriminating whether or not an information processing device having the same font manager as that of the subject information processing device is present among the information processing devices having the required font information, as shown in Figs. 6A and 6B. If none is present, but if an information processing device has font information that can be converted into the data format of the font manager of the subject information processing device, such font information is so converted and loaded into the subject information processing device. However, Applicant has found nothing in Yoshida that would teach or suggest "a display unit configured to display a selection window accepting a user selection of a code system from among the first code systems obtained by said first obtainment unit when said determination unit determines that the second code system is not included in the first code systems" or "a second conversion unit, configured to convert a code system of the font designated by said designation unit in conformity with the code system selected in the selection window, and then convert a data format of the font into a data format utilizable by the printer," as recited in Claim 13.

11

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 13 is not anticipated by Yoshida.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 13.

Independent Claims 17 and 21 are method and program claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 17, and are believed to be patentable over Yoshida for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 13.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/
Jennifer A. Reda
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1933757v1